CAMPUS INFORMATION

District Name	Southwest ISD	**Campus Name**	Hidden Cove STEAM Academy	**Superintendent**	Brandon Crisp
District Number	015912	**Campus Number**	015912106	**Executive Director/Principal Supervisor**	Veronica Cuenca-Wilson

ASSURANCES

Principal Supervisor	I, as supervisor of the principal for this campus, attest that I will provide or facilitate the provision of all the necessary district-level commitments and support mechanisms to ensure the principal I supervise can achieve successful implementation of the Targeted Improvement Plan for this campus. I understand I am responsible for ensuring the principal carries out the plan elements as indicated herein.
Principal	I, as principal for this campus, attest that I will coordinate with my supervisor, to use the district-provided commitments and support mechanisms to ensure the successful implementation of the Targeted Improvement Plan for this campus. I agree to carry out the plan elements as indicated herein.

DATA ANALYSIS

Using your accountability data from 2026, and any relevant student achievement data from 2025-2026, to set reasonable goals in each domain (1, 2, and 3). Include what special student groups you will be monitoring for progress.

Data Analysis Questions	What accountability goals for each Domain has your campus set for the year? Be sure to include how you determined the goal for each domain and how these goals will impact your overall Accountability Rating.	Domain 1: For the 26-27 SY, we will increase STAAR Math and Reading to 75% in Approaches, 55% in Meets , and 25% in Masters. Rationale: We have seen the effectiveness of instruction with the use of HQIM and have see the postive results in campuses with similar demographics and believe that similar results are attainable at HCSA. The improvement in domain 1 will help us achieve our goal of attaining a B rating Domain 2: The campus is looking to attain 16 points of growth in domain 2A while maintaining student achievement.
	What changes in student group and subject performance are included in these goals?	Domain 1: Domain 2: Domain 3:

CAMPUS FOCUS AREAS

Use information from your *Reflective Activity* on the *ESF Levers (if available)* to complete the following section.

ESF LEVERS	**Implementation Level** (**1** Not Yet Started - **5** Fully Implemented)
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership	3 - Beginning Implementation
Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing	4 - Partial Implementation
Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems	3 - Beginning Implementation
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials	3 - Beginning Implementation
Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building	4 - Partial Implementation
Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations	4 - Partial Implementation

PRIORITIZED FOCUS AREAS

Complete each section below:

From the drop-down menu, select 1-2 Levers the campus has selected to prioritize for the 2026-27 school year.

Rationale: Explain the reason(s) the campus chose to focus on this ESF Lever this school year.

Capacity Building: For each prioritized focus area selected, list any internal/external capacity building efforts or cohorts in which you will participate this year.

Barriers: For each prioritized focus area selected, list the barriers to implementation the campus may face throughout the year.

Desired Annual Outcome: For each prioritized focus area selected, create your annual goal that is specific, measurable, attainable, and realistic.

	Prioritized Focus Area #1	Prioritized Focus Area #2
ESF Lever	**Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials**	**Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership**
Rationale	We selected Lever 4 to eliminate the variance in rigor across classrooms and ensure consistent, equitable access to TEKS-aligned, grade-level content, ensuring that a student's academic outcome is not determined by their teacher's individual curriculum creation skills. Focusing on Lever 4 will allow us to shift professional learning communities (PLCs) from lesson creation to lesson internalization, enabling teachers to focus on meeting the specific needs of their students using vetted resources. Analysis of our data reveals a disconnect between daily classroom grades and standardized assessment performance. Lever 4 addresses this by ensuring our daily materials and formative assessments are tightly aligned to the rigor of state standards, closing the gap between what is taught and what is tested. To drive data-driven instruction (Lever 5), we first need reliable data. Lever 4 provides valid, standards-aligned interim assessments that will allow leadership and teachers to accurately diagnose student misconceptions and plan targeted interventions (RTI/MTSS) based on actual learning needs rather than faulty assessment items	To achieve rapid and sustainable gains in student performance, we selectedLever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning as a focus area. A comprehensive diagnostic revealed that while instructional efforts are ongoing, campus outcomes are hindered by a lack of streamlined monitoring systems, undefined instructional roles, and inconsistent implementation routines. Focusing on Lever 1 addresses the root cause of our implementation gaps by establishing clear instructional leadership responsibilities, routine observation-and-feedback cycles, and rigorous performance management tracking aligned to our assessment data. By building strong foundational systems under Lever 1, campus leadership will effectively drive, monitor, and sustain improvements in high-quality instruction (Lever 5) and campus culture (Lever 3) throughout the school year.

How will the campus build capacity in this area? **Who will you partner with?**	The campus will leverage the expertise of content coordinators in the department of teaching and learning to create HQIM assessments. Additionally, the department of teaching and learning has created and vetted lesson plans for the district provided HQIM and the campus will use these plans to ensure students are provided high quality instructional materials. The campus instructional leadership team (principal, assistant principal, academic coach, campus interventionist) will participate in and facilitate planning sessions to ensure that teachers are internalizing lessons and utilizing the HQIM. An area of emphasis is lesson internalization for both math (bluebonnet) and RLA (HMH) as we have many teachers for whom this is a new curriculum resource	**See It, Name It, Do It**: Train administrators (Principals, APs, Instructional Coaches) on the Get Better Faster or Leverage Leadership frameworks. Leaders must practice identifying a single, high-leverage "action step" during classroom walkthroughs rather than giving long lists of general feedback. **Practice Grounding in Evidence:** Conduct "norming walks" where campus leaders observe the same classroom together and debrief immediately after to align on what high-quality instruction looks like and practice scripting bite-sized feedback. **Data Meetings**: Train leaders to facilitate structured 30-minute weekly data meetings with teacher teams. Rather than just looking at overall scores, leaders practice guiding teachers to analyze student work samples, isolate precise misconceptions, and re-teach specific skills **Blocked Instructional Calendars:** Set non-negotiable windows on administrative calendars for daily classroom walkthroughs and coaching meetings. **Operational Offloading:** Create clear protocols and point-persons for daily non-instructional tasks (e.g., assigning subs, discipline escalations, or facility issues to designated staff) so instructional leaders are not constantly interrupted. The campus is partnering with NIET through the LASO 4 grant to provide coaching and systems support for the campus instrucitonal leadership team and will utilize **Observation Protocols**: Implement a single, unified walkthrough form (via Eduphoria) so data collection across all campus administrators is consistent. **Meeting Templates:** Utilize standardized agendas for Instructional Leadership Team meetings and teacher coaching sessions to ensure every meeting focuses on student outcomes and actionable next steps.
Barriers to Address throughout this year	**Teacher mindset:** Teachers believe the provided HQIM is too rigorous for their specific student population, leading them to lower the bar or revert to lower-level supplementary materials. Teachers view the HQIM as scripted, restrictive to their creativity and autonomy, causing them to modify lessons in ways that strip away the intended rigor or alignment. Veteran staff hold a deep attachment to legacy lesson plans or internet-sourced activities (e.g., TPT, Pinterest) that are not aligned to the current TEKS or rigor levels. **Lack of deep content knowledge:** Teachers struggle to internalize the "why" behind the lesson design because they do not fully understand the conceptual shifts in the standards (e.g., the science of reading shifts or conceptual math progressions). Teachers can identify that a student didn't understand, but lack the skill to determine why (e.g., procedural error vs. conceptual misunderstanding) based on the HQIM assessments. **Ineffective Lesson Internalization:** Teachers are "planning" by reading the lesson right before teaching it, rather than utilizing a structured internalization protocol (e.g., doing the work themselves, anticipating student misconceptions) days in advance. **Lack of Pacing Guards:** There is no system to monitor pacing, resulting in teachers falling behind the scope and sequence, eventually forcing them to skip critical units to "catch up" before state testing.	**Operational Distractions:** Administrators frequently get pulled away from instructional coaching and data planning to manage student discipline, duty coverage, facility issues, and administrative compliance. **Lack of Protected Calendars:** Even when weekly coaching or data meetings are scheduled they are often canceled or displaced by day-to-day campus emergencies. **Feedback Quality:** Feedback given to teachers is often too general (e.g., "Great engagement!") rather than actionable, bite-sized instructional steps tied to student performance data. **Lack of Teacher Buy-In:** Frequent leadership observations can be perceived as punitive ("evaluative monitoring") rather than supportive ("developmental coaching"). **Data Delays:** Lack of real-time, high-quality assessment data makes data-driven leadership routines reactive instead of proactive. **Misaligned District Support:** District expectations or scheduling mandates conflict with protected campus instructional leadership time.

How will you communicate these priorities to your stakeholders? How will create buy-in?	The campus instructional team will share the campus' HQIM priorities with faculty and staff during our back to school faculty meetings, PLC/planning and faculty meetings. Parents and community members will receive the message regarding our new HQIM curriculum resources during our family engagement nights, open house events, and in newsletters. To facilitate buy in, we will help teachers understand that the use of HQIM is going to give them more time to prepare for instruction (via internalization) because they will not have to plan for what is taught, but how best to teacher it. For parents and students, we will share that we are respecting our students by giving them challenging work which will help them show master of the curriculum and normalizing academic/productive struggle. We will also emphasize that with the explicit instruction of the HQIM, parents will know exactly what their child is learning and how to support them.	Clear, targeted communication is essential to building alignment and trust across all stakeholder groups: To Teachers and Staff: The message is one of support, not scrutiny. Walkthroughs and weekly meetings are explicitly designed to remove instructional guesswork, provide hands-on coaching, and equip educators with the tools and resources needed to succeed. To Parents and Families: The messaging focuses on academic excellence and consistency. Families are assured that campus leaders are actively present in classrooms every day, maintaining high academic standards and ensuring every child receives top-tier instruction. To District Leadership: Communication centers on accountability and systems. We present a clear operational roadmap with explicit interim benchmarks, showing how protected administrative time and data-monitoring loops directly correlate with gains in student achievement. By anchoring our Targeted Improvement Plan in ESF Lever 1, we construct a resilient foundation—one that empowers leaders, supports teachers, engages families, and delivers academic success for every student on our campus.
Desired Annual Outcome	100% of instructional staff participate in weekly 'Lesson Internalization' meetings where they practice key modeling moments and script higher-order thinking questions prior to delivery. Teachers analyze benchmark and assessment data within 48 hours to plan re-teach loops for the following week. 100% of teachers in tested grades/subjects will utilize the district-provided High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) with fidelity, as evidenced by consistent use of the scope and sequence, daily lesson execution, and weekly lesson internalization protocols.	By the conclusion of the instructional year, HCSA will have established and institutionalized the foundational routines of ESF Lever 1 Specifically, the campus leadership team will maintain a minimum 85% fidelity rate on scheduled weekly walkthroughs and coaching debriefs across all core classrooms. 100% of core teacher teams (PLCs) will operate with a standardized Weekly Meeting protocol that directly informs first teach and re-teach cycles based on formative assessment data. Through these operational structures, campus leaders will achieve a 100% completion rate on quarterly TIP interim benchmark reviews, ensuring that administrative time, teacher coaching, and student performance tracking function as a cohesive, continuous improvement loop